

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_103400
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATING THE EFFECTS OF BRAND EQUITY AND WEBSITE QUALITY ON CONSUMER PERCEPTIONS AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS TOWARDS M-COMMERCE ADOPTION IN THE APPAREL RETAIL INDUSTRY: AN EXTENDED TECHNOLOGY ACCEPTANCE (TAM) PERSPECTIVE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Interesting manuscript with a study of consumer behavior that contributes to marketing management so it is important to the scientific community</p> <p>The title of the article is too long, it can be made more concise and memorable</p> <p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive</p> <p>Article writing is too long, some sections and subsections of the manuscript need to be made more concise. Discussion of results and conclusions is made separately. Conclusions are made more concise which include empirical findings, recommendations, study limitations and suggestions for future research.</p> <p>The manuscript has good scientific value with a note that it needs some improvement, especially the discussion section of the results which is expanded with debates between findings and previous empirical evidence and confrontation with the underlying theory</p> <p>References are sufficient and up-to-date. The following additional reference suggestions may be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mansur, S., Saragih, N., Susilawati, S., Udud, Y., & Endri, E. (2021). Consumer brand engagement and brand communications on destination brand equity maritime tourism in Indonesia. <i>Journal of Environmental Management & Tourism</i>, 12(4), 1032-1042. Samosir, J., Purba, O., Ricardianto, P., Dinda, M., Rafi, S., Sinta, A., ... & Endri, E. (2023). The role of social media marketing and brand equity on e-WOM: Evidence from Indonesia. <i>International Journal of Data and Network Science</i>, 7(2), 609-626. Indrasari, A., Nadjmie, N., & Endri, E. (2022). Determinants of satisfaction and loyalty of e-banking users during the COVID-19 pandemic. <i>International Journal of Data and Network Science</i>, 6(2), 497-508. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the language/English of the articles is not suitable for scientific communication, especially in the interpretation of statistical results</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The word "Significant" in the hypothesis statement is deleted, because it has not been tested</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Ethical issues in this manuscript are multiple publications</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Endri Endri
Department, University & Country	Universitas Mercu Buana, Indonesia